

Bay Management Steering Committee Meeting
August 15th 2006
Bowdoin Coastal Studies Center, Orrs Island

Introductions:

Steering Committee: Dave Schmanska, Barbara Vickery, Kathleen Billings, Heather Deese, Paul Anderson, DeWitt John, Jim Salisbury

Staff: Vanessa Levesque, Deirdre Gilbert, Seth Barker, Mary Costigan, Todd Burrowes, Kathleen Leyden, John Sowles,

Members of the Public: Sebastian Belle, Roger Fleming, Susan Faraday, Kathy Ramsdall, Steve Perrin

Scribe: Elizabeth Stephenson

Reviewed Agenda

Steering committee accepted minutes from previous meetings.

Review of “Draft Schedule Through 2007”

- Questions from Steering Committee

- How much interaction has there been with the Land and Water Resources Council?
We have presented an update of the bay management study at every LWRC meeting, and have recently met with a LWRC subcommittee that is interested in tracking the bay management study more closely.
- Will the table-top exercise be with agency commissioners or some level of people who know what’s going on? Will NGO’s be included in Table-top exercise? It would be good to have a representative local official, such as a harbormaster at Table-Top exercise.
We had initially planned for the tabletop exercise to be attended by at least two people from each relevant agency – someone who has a higher level policy perspective and someone who works more directly in local communities. It would be a good idea to also include someone from the local level, such as a harbormaster.
- We probably will need more steering committee meetings – you can probably get rid of the question mark. It’d be good to have time to go over a draft report. That extra step would be a reality check in terms of which recommendations we think the Legislature will go for.
Yes, let’s schedule another meeting when we reconvene after lunch. It would be good to have it after the public meetings but before the December LWRC meeting.
- What’s the purpose of public meetings in November? Are you simply presenting the report or looking for feedback?
We will be looking for feedback on the draft report.

John Sowles Presentation

Draft Problem Statement and Principles

Discussion of Problem Statement

Jim: If you have a problem statement it can dictate the direction you need to go in. What we're trying to do is synthesize where this is some tangible way to improve things. We're just trying to say here are all the things that are happening. Are you anticipating that in the final form you will be presenting alternatives or will you try to get to some coherent recommendation?

KL: We were asked to present a range of options. We will look more closely at budgets needed for each alternative and provide guidance on what we think will work for Maine. We will identify the preferred option.

Paul/Heather: The sentence in the first full paragraph at the bottom of p 2 is a good summary of the problems. Maybe put this at the beginning and then list examples afterwards. (Sentence starts out...“Thus while there is currently no widely-recognized, coastwide crisis, there is a pervasive and persistent sense that cumulative changes...”)

Paul: Social implications of growth and change...should we say that, “government agencies involved tend to conduct their business in isolation from one another and often are unable to address the diversity of expectations from multiple sectors or stakeholders.”

Todd: Agencies do coordinate and can't be expected to cover the full spectrum of problems. There can be improvements but to put it so starkly is to overstate the problem.

Kathleen B: Folks are intimidated by layers of process in government. They don't understand the concept that everyone has their own box.

Dave: There doesn't seem to be continuity in the regulatory process. You can get two different answers from the same agency let alone across agencies.

John: The expectation of a unified outcome is unreasonable but improving the process and increasing access can be done and the request was heard loud and clear at public meetings.

Vanessa: There are two levels of coordination and communication between agencies. While there is communication between agencies at higher policy levels to work on joint projects or some issues, community dissatisfaction might relate more to a lack of communication or coordination between staff from different agencies that interact more directly with those local communities.

DeWitt: At top of page two: change the word “Perception” to “Experience” in “Perception that government agencies are not sufficiently coordinated...”

Paul: This group is obliged to look at the construct of our agencies and consider reworking it rather than trying to fit things to the existing structures. There might be other ways to run those functions of governments.

DeWitt: After problem statement and examples, it would be good to say here are some ways to deal with this problem and this is the one that we recommend. You need something that explains this clearly to ordinary people.

Heather: Under “finding solutions” paragraph there’s a definition of bay management. Shouldn’t we discuss this definition?

KL: The definition is from Aquaculture Task Force. We are moving towards not using the term “bay management” but instead saying improvements in management of nearshore waters. Bay management can’t be defined; instead it is part of a suite of options that can improve management of nearshore waters.

Barbara: What is not included is “proactive planning”. Are most of our recommendations going to be about improving management but not about proactive planning for siting of things? I think some people thought that’s what this study was going to do.

Heather: If Bay management is not the right term then just say improved nearshore management.

Jim: We should give some thought to what distinguishes nearshore management. Don’t we by necessity have to have some interlocal agreements in this? Beef up the regional aspects in the report. It’s the stuff in between the local and state levels that needs to be addressed.

Vanessa: We plan to add the description of scale, scope and approach from the working definition to the end of this problem statement.

Paul: It seems like we are after better management of coastal resources. The regional component is a piece or a characteristic of better governance. We need something that honors regional approaches but also ecosystem and science based approaches as well as the public trust.

Barbara: I agree with Paul but if we are going to broaden our horizons in that way we need to report on how we made that journey.

Kathleen B: I want to add the perception that “we like it the way it is and we don’t want it there,” for example people concerned about mussel dragging in front of their

house, etc. People who want their view protected, etc. People don't understand that others do make their living off of the sea.

Heather: The report touches on this but doesn't come out and say here are two predominant views that are in conflict.

Paul: Do we end up with a vision for Maine's coast that preserves working waterfront as our demographics change?

Discussion of Principles:

Heather: Having the sentiment of the precautionary principle would be good to have in there even if you don't call it by its name.

Paul: The word "regional" isn't on here. If there's agreement towards going in that direction then something about regional approaches to governance of ecological management should be in here.

Barbara: The concept that the whole coast is not the same is buried in the second bullet of the Ecological section ("recognize that coastal systems are naturally dynamic...") I think it needs it's own bullet.

Dewitt: It would be good to say, "of all these principles, these are the ones we need to do a better job at." And that could lead you into your recommendations. Take the second bullet in ecological section "recognize that coastal systems..." This seems very obvious but we could phrase in such a way that considers climate change.

Barbara: You could look at it as...In recognition of the dynamism and the big changes coming, our management needs to be flexible and adaptive. Getting the system to move is very hard. Adaptive management is not just about compatible uses, it is something that integrates the interactions and feedback loops present in all of these uses.

Jim: I can see the working waterfront sentence being taken a lot of ways. It sounds like new uses can not use our working waterfront. Those are loaded statements and how it reads depends on where you sit.

John: Could we change it to supporting marine dependent uses and supporting innovation.

Jim: We want to support the continuation of uses even though they may be marginalized. There are uses that the lobster fishery has taken away. Try to build a weir and see what would happen. We need to maintain a working waterfront that supports a multiplicity of uses.

Dave: What is the definition of traditional use? Page 3 of the draft quotes the Coastal Management policy act. You could read a lot of these ideas on expanding uses as counter to traditional use.

Heather: Maybe we could just say “maintain working waterfront”

Jim: There are two aspects – preserving the marginal uses and enhancing/enabling the new uses.

Options for Nearshore Management **- Vanessa and Deirdre**

Heather: Can we leave out the term “comprehensive plans” (p 3 at bottom) because it sounds like town comprehensive plan. It would be helpful to say that these initiatives are just a list of ideas. Interlocal agreements would not be required for cooperation of local governments. There can also be efforts outside of government participation (Muscongus Bay).

Jim: What doesn’t require an authority that is worth our support?

Todd: Casco Bay Estuary Partnership has no authority but functions as regional entity.

KL: There are things that require permitting but not a new authority (eelgrass restoration, for example).

Deirdre continues going over draft

Barbara: What the towns are proposing to do must match their capacity and also not neglect ecological units. Here is an opportunity to write that in under criteria.

Heather: I am concerned that you will be overwhelmed with requests for funding.

Vanessa: Funding wouldn’t be an open-ended thing, instead we would go through an RFP process with identified priorities.

Heather: There are differences between very localized projects and those that are more widely regional in scope.

DeWitt: Have in this report an illustration of statewide goals that might guide people in terms of projects. Solicit information and advice about goals from groups such as Casco Bay Estuary Partnership. Make it less academic and more real.

Heather: Give specific examples...a potential project could look like this. What are some things that have been done?

Kathleen B: Are the state vision and bay management goals and objectives going to be compatible? How do you make it meaningful in the end?

Vanessa: We plan to create state-level vision and goals. We didn't feel we could make meaningful regional goals that are specific to certain embayments; that would be a task more appropriate to people who live and work in that area. We could make that a recommendation in the study for regions to create goals that the support state-level vision.

Heather: You could set some minimum standards.

Barbara: I have lost track of desired outcome of this discussion. Do you want to hear from us that directionally this appears right to us or whether in the final report we would set some bay management goals and objectives? I am not sure what level of specificity we are trying to reach.

KL: We don't have time to today to set the goals but if you can give us some kind of direction that would be helpful.

Barbara: When I read sentences that say "we will do" such and such, I don't know if those are things for us (steering comm./staff) to do or whether those things will stay in the report as is.

Kathleen B: How do you enhance and facilitate local involvement? Do we need to spell that out? Will the Legislature want us to explain that?

Deirdre: My understanding was that it would be so project specific that we could not spell that out ahead of time.

Vanessa: We don't want to dictate how a group must carry out its project. We believe that appropriate methods will depend on what an entity wants to accomplish. Therefore, we will spell out some criteria, like involvement of appropriate stakeholders, and then ask the entity to show us how they will do so. At higher levels of support, we will be more specific in the criteria we set.

Kathleen B: You must have some vision of what those requirements are because otherwise how are you going to evaluate what they decide to do?

Vanessa: Maybe this is something that we need to discuss further.

KL: An RFP might include a requirement to tell us more about how you are going to do this. There could be criteria if there was funding at stake.

Dave: Are we talking about what is in 2nd paragraph of p 6 referring to interlocal agreements?

Heather: We need more concrete examples of what regional initiatives would look like and who would be involved, etc. Put these right up front to give people a vision.

KL: The pilot projects are our best examples right now.

DeWitt: This should be labeled as a process of getting started. Pilot projects are examples. We didn't have enough money or time for these to make a substantial difference with the pilot projects.

Barbara: Did you have any discussion about who would decide on the RFPs?

Jim: In one sense you have the pilot projects – start to think about what this is. The next stage is there's a problem and something needs to be done...requires intervention. Thirdly, you might have something that requires interlocal agreements where you need to create a new level of authority. We don't want to yet get lost into what kind of projects we are going to fund. Let's not get too specific yet. We need to characterize the different kinds of activity that are anticipated. Some things might require regulatory intervention as opposed to funding.

Fostering Regional Bay Management Through Interlocal Agreements

-Todd's presentation

Barbara: Given that Legislature has to decide about certain things, like fisheries, towns could not make these decisions on their own unless the legislature specifically said they could.

Mary passes around Kennebunk River Agreement as an example of an interlocal agreement.

Barbara: I see the concern about not getting buried alive with proposals as being in conflict with our ideas of providing incentives.

Confusion about master agreement idea...would it be statewide?

Todd: No, it would be regional among relevant municipalities.

What to do if one town doesn't agree?

Kathleen: This Kennebunk River one covers a lot of things in that arena.

Dave: Does anyone know what stimulated the Kennebunk River agreement? Usually it's because the state is going to come in and do something.

Jim: I would synthesize these two sections into one (referring to supporting regional initiatives and to interlocal agreements). You have the basics of a simplified structure...the basis of what could be going on. There's a study type of activity

where people try to figure out what needs to be done. Then there are things people want to do that don't require state involvement – using existing interlocal power, then there are things that require the state to be involved but doesn't mean it's the sole activity of the state. These three things encompass the conceptual activity that could happen. The one we have unexplored ground in is the latter with interlocal activity that involves the state. When is it appropriate to have something that the state participates in that also involves an interlocal agreement? If we think that's an open area still then that's where we need to put some criteria as to what limits that activity. That's where we want to get into some specifics...we don't want to leave this open without some ground rules.

Barbara: Do we have examples of the exercise of interlocal agreements that include state involvement?

Todd: No

John: Interlocal municipal shellfish plans involve the state

Mary: We signed the plans and gave them the authority.

Jim: The state cedes authority to assign/place moorings to harbormaster through Harbormaster's Act.

Barbara: We talked about the state as being monolithic. But we are going to be dealing with more than one agency and things could get very complicated.

Jim: This is where things get mucky and where we need to set criteria. We don't have someone in the state who can walk people through all the steps. If you are going to get into the state/interlocal agreements you need someone to play the role of advisor.

LUNCH

Afternoon Session

The steering committee agreed to set aside another meeting date (Friday December 1st, Location TBD) in addition to the meeting already scheduled for October 2nd.

Public Comment:

Steve Perrin: I was afraid that the baby was getting tossed with the bath water. I did not hear a vision of the coast of Maine that we all love dearly and that we want to have continued in as good a condition as possible. I latch onto the idea of ecosystems, not arbitrary town boundaries. Let's think of how the Gulf of Maine is organized. The resources we take out of the Gulf are only there because of the working ecosystems that sustain them. The only way to protect the public trust is to

ensure the continuity of the ecosystems. We manage our uses, not the actual ecosystems. I don't get a sense that this group is talking about the same Gulf of Maine that I am talking about. I have noticed in Taunton Bay that eel grass is down, there are few winter flounders, urchins and scallops are commercially extinct. The ecosystem is not functioning the way it has done in the past and that is because of us. How can we regulate our behaviors so that the Gulf can do its thing? The kind of discussion here lacks the kind of vision that unifies the coast. I have divided the coast into 8 ecosystem divisions (lists them). We need to talk about the coast in meaningful terms not in terms of cities but in terms of ecoregions or ecosystems. The fundamental part of the Taunton Bay study was looking at ecosystem function. Ecosystems are also processes, not just places on a map. The more specific you are the more specifically you tailor the uses to what's there, the better off the Gulf will be. I have lots more to say but I will stop there for now. *(I didn't capture the exact wording but Steve also mentioned that he wanted to see more attention paid to the ideas in the grey boxes on p 1)*

Susan Faraday: I applaud the staff for all the work, time and attention you have put into this. In terms of housekeeping it wasn't always clear to me that the document we were working off of was the same as the one you have been working on over email, etc.

Overarching comments: The Aquaculture Task Force study put the focus on Bay Management but that now seems to be too narrow. I think this needs to be expressly stated. A focus on empowering Bay Management is not going to work unless it is assessed that the proper state structure exists to support it. My sense is we don't have that structure. My problem statement is that our resources are under more and more cumulative pressure and our government structure is fragmented and is not up to the challenge of protecting those resources nor the people who count on those resources. Bay Management has to fit into a bigger framework of nearshore management or whatever you want to call it. I have a problem envisioning interlocal groups working away at problems on their own without guidance, without the state knowing what is going on. I think that a state vision is imperative. When you present your results from this study, coastal resources are going to be on stage before the Legislature. What a great opportunity to educate the Legislature about these issues and how under-funded these areas are. This is a great time to make the case for the importance of these resources to the Legislature. The Table-Top exercise sounds great to me but I am curious as to why it's happening late in the game. In addition to considering other members I think it would be appropriate to let members of the public listen to that.

Some specifics on the document: Working Outline under problem statement B3 we need to include other federal agencies and laws that interact. Now to the principles: They need to be strong statements and not facts. A principle is our, "ecosystems shall be healthy, resilient, vibrant." Recognizing something is not the same as a principle. I think these need to be in a strong active voice, not a passive voice. That will tell whoever what the state thinks is important. I don't agree that all principles are equivalent. I think there should be some thought about stating that we need to

take care of these resources if we want to have use of them in the future. That's an important principle that needs to be in there. I agree with Steve Perrin that Box C needs some more airing.

Roger Fleming: I agree with Steve and Susan's comments. And, I second Susan's statement that now is your chance to make a statement to the Legislature about the management of resources into the future. Like Steve, I would like to see more emphasis on ecosystem function throughout the document because that's the fundamental building block. In terms of the principles: The second paragraph, I would like to see the public trust reference pulled down into the body of the principles. I don't understand the reluctance in putting in the terms ecosystem based management, etc. There is no need to reinvent a statement of principles. There's the example set by the Coastal Management Policies Act. I am encouraged to see there are a lot of different options being looked at, but, in addition to principles I think you are going to need to set some criteria about what those activities might entail in order for the state to maintain the public trust.

Kathy Ramsdall: Overarching comments: I agree this is a chance for you to be bold. Consider dividing up the coast into regional embayments and then have interlocal groups make decisions as needed. If this isn't science based it won't do anything. User conflict was what was behind this effort. I don't think this document talks about how user conflicts will be resolved. Unless interlocal groups have a diverse group of stakeholders, you have the danger of bias. We have a good situation in Casco Bay and there's money repeatedly at the table which attracts people to the process. I think this group needs to look more closely at the Casco Bay model.

There are a lot of conflicts that need to be addressed – looming problems such as wind farms and what is the importance of aesthetics. This is dividing up the public in ways that we wouldn't have anticipated.

Before you get further embroiled in setting up funding for these studies it is important to say to the Legislature that we want state agencies to see how they can engage in interdisciplinary activity and use the collective information to inform the interlocal groups. We have worked very hard to get one person appointed to coordinate issues surrounding dredging.

Sebastian: You guys worked very hard. Keep working. I am not going to say anything.

Return to Steering Committee

“Paul's Big Ideas”

I am afraid in getting ourselves so consumed by details, we are missing some of what we have talked about in terms of our problem statement. We are doing the stakeholder involvement piece but we haven't addressed the governance piece of the

problem statement. I think there are two parallel recommendations that we need to forward to LWRC. One is about stakeholder involvement. But I also think we need to codify a vision that survives political change. I was discouraged that the vision we came up with in the aquaculture task force was not codified by the state. Secondly, I would like to talk about some of the things in the grey boxes here. Bay Management groups need a place to go and it's not going to be one agency. KL mentioned that LWRC had a standing committee on coastal issues. Should that be reinstated? What about the Board of Environmental Protection model? Is it worth our having a BEP for marine issues or maybe there should be a few of these boards representing different regions. I am not trying to restructure gov't because that's probably too severe. I think there needs to be a leadership function in gov't and I don't have the answer to that but am wondering if we need to be forwarding that idea to the Legislature.

KL: You have to have a vehicle for implementing a vision. One example is the Coastal Management Policies Act saying you shall carry out your duties under the guidance of these policies. Another is the Growth Management Act that has goals and also incorporates the Coastal Policies.

Deirdre: There needs to be a distinction between a vision- how we'd *like* things to be and a law – how they *have* to be.

Paul: The NY idea was interesting to me. (Reads from handout). They are trying to do in NY through this council what I think we ought to do in Maine.

DeWitt: Model from the federal government...Agencies come up with numerical goals of how the world should change. They submit that to OMB and if the agency is not meeting their goal then either they need more money or the agency shouldn't be in charge of that task anymore. Councils are fudgeable. Money is fudgeable, too but it hurts more when it is fudged.

KL: What is your reaction to Paul's ideas?

Heather: There are a bunch of jobs or responsibilities that we have identified as gaps and I don't know who should be in charge of those jobs. We are going to need some body that is going to be carrying this process forward at the state level. Whether that sits at SPO or BEP, somebody will have to put out, score and administer the RFP. And where does the buck stop? If the towns or group members don't agree on something, then who has the final decision-making responsibility? Right now that sits with different agencies.

Barbara: Is that in support of Paul's idea of a state structure?

Heather: Yes, but I don't know what it would look like.

Dave: I think we have the idea of the types of things an agency would be dealing with but we don't know what the agency would be or would look like. There have

been 4 people that have noted that gap and that scares me given that we are far into this process.

Paul: We addressed a lot of particulars with aquaculture recommendations and the Bay Management piece picked up on trying to address the disenfranchisement of local citizens. If a person had concerns about dredging, where do they go, for example?

John: I think there are answers within the existing system. I don't know what a new multi-agency group would solve that we couldn't solve with the existing system. Within the existing agencies there's already a lack of communication among offices. I don't have a problem with a multi-agency group but it may not solve the communication problem.

Heather: Is there a way to make life easier for agency employees as well? If there was one group that you would be able to consult, could this streamline things? I don't endorse a super-agency idea.

KL: There are coastal projects that go to BEP already. Are you saying that there needs to be a BEP that looks at things other than the existing core laws? I thought that we considered the BEP model at our last meeting and decided not to pursue it, but perhaps the conversation concluded prematurely due to lack of time on the agenda.

Heather: Could BEP handle more things if you gave them more responsibility or could you take the coastal things from BEP and give them to a different coordinating coastal body?

Paul: I don't mean to say the BEP is the model we should follow but just that there are other examples out there to look at. For example, let's say we have a group that wants a marine transportation plan to understand moorings, navigational hazards, etc. Are we helping them by enabling that activity without giving them support and guidance to ensure that the plan is being vetted by the right people? Do we need a go-to place or person who understands all these issues? I think there are also regulatory activities that would benefit from that oversight as well.

DeWitt: I think that creating boards and councils is not the way government is going lately. Somebody has to figure out what is happening on the coast of Maine, what are the parameters that should guide the government. You can do these things without setting up a new bureaucracy. You can do that outside of state government...look at the Casco Bay model. I think it's better to think about the function rather than the structure of things. Not rules-based, but performance-based. You could have ecosystem goals and there would be numbers that would run across the entire state and that could be broken down regionally.

Dave: Coastal Management Policies read to me more like principles than what we have here.

Barbara: When was the Coastal Management Policies Act enacted, what does it say? If we already have these in place then adding to principles may not do anything.

KL: It's not a living, breathing policy statute. It was a directive on how we were going to implement the Maine Coastal Program. You couldn't do all of them in one place.

Heather: It sounds like we should we at least take a look at all 10 of them.

(missed some dialogue in here while looking up Coastal Management Policies Act)

Dave: My only point is that if this is already codified then there's no need to reinvent the wheel but instead focus on their implementation.

Kathleen B: One of the major complaints about aquaculture siting was that there was not enough public input in the process. That's what spurred the Bay Management process and we need to solve this issue.

KL: In the interest of time maybe we should spend our October meeting on goals and objectives. Is this the right group to be setting coastal policies or at least create a starting point? Or is it something we give to another group?

Heather: I think it is important to prioritize your principles because they will be in conflict at some point.

Barbara: I think we agreed that we want to say something about those broader issues shown as the grey boxes in the schematic on p 1. Also, everything we are talking about is going to require more resources. I think that getting more dollars is not going to happen through the things in the black box. I think it has to be a higher level vision. I think a lot of these issues would already be addressed if DMR had twice the staff they have now....it's a capacity issue. How are we going to replicate the Casco Bay situation where money enables some things to happen? I don't think we need to create a new agency but I think you could say that the State of Maine needs a vision and strategic plans. The community piece should definitely be a part of that plan.

Dave: It's imperative that we take an in-depth look at Coastal Management Policies Act. Maybe tweaking the policies that are in statute now will free us up to consider other things.

KL: These Policies don't offer us guidance that is enforceable.

Todd: The purpose of the Policies is to have agencies adapt their programs to meet these goals.

Heather: If agencies had to have regular consistency reviews with these policies in mind, would this serve our goals?

Data and Information Needs

Seth's and Vanessa's presentation

Barbara: When you say data collection do you mean people going out and collecting data from the field or do you mean data aggregation – putting together existing sources?

Vanessa: Both, really.

Barbara: In order to do Bay Management and consider cumulative, interactive types of things, you also need hypotheses or to consider processes of how things work. There's a whole lot more context that's needed...is this the only place in the state that such and such happens, for example. Or, for example, this process is normal and natural here because of the offshore currents, etc.

Seth: I remember Dave Townsend saying you need to identify the connections between offshore currents and the embayments. Some work came out of that but not enough to provide a rich data source along the coast. You'd have to get groups of people together to ask, "what are the big questions that need to be addressed?"

Barbara: What groups are there in Maine that decide what the big research questions are?

DeWitt: You need data to further science but you also need data for management. You might want to look at places that are trying to do database management, places that use that data for management. One place to try is the National Marine Sanctuary System. They have a savvy approach on how to pick the data they need for management and how to entice people to go get it.

John: RARGROM idea was similar to this. Maybe it's time to look at this again. Sea Grant, Gulf of Maine Council are regional, not just Maine based but these are just some ideas.

Paul: Regional Sea Grant programs are about to undergo a regional research exercise. This is responding to OMB's interest in regionalizing efforts.

Paul: In terms of GIS, don't forget what capacity is already out there. The Ocean Data Partnership is an innovative way to have access to multiple data sets without having them all in one place.

Heather: I get nervous about the focus on data because the point is to have understanding and expertise, not just data. For a group who wants to start Bay Management in their area it would be useful to know what data other groups found to be useful, why they found it to be useful and how they obtained that data. In Taunton Bay, for example, Barbara Arter's work was received very positively. It was good to have that process. That could be a useful learning experience to pass on.

Vanessa: This piece is meant to also focus on data sharing, not just the acquisition of the data. Every sentence that talks about the data should also talk about the sharing.

DeWitt: It's good you are taking this (data, information and GIS needs) on.

Public Comment Period #2

Kathy Ramsdall: We (Friends of Casco Bay) have been collecting water quality data using trained people and based on EPA protocols for 15 years. There are ways to do data collection that don't have to involve the money required to employ scientists. We have been working hard to raise money to redesign the platform for our database to make it more manageable. It costs a lot of money to do this and there aren't a lot of vendors out there. I like the idealism that you are going to come up with these data warehouses but it often falls on groups like mine to come up with a way and the resources to do this. It can be done with a working group of volunteers but our example is just one bay and just one parameter. I suggest you pick a few simple recommendations and go with those. Think about how TMDL is being looked at – kind of an ecosystem approach for rivers. Can you use this model in marine systems? Also it's confusing that the Natural Resources Committee handles many things that it seems the Marine Resources Committee should handle. Maybe you want to tackle this jurisdictional issue.

Sebastian: If you look at your principles of Bay Management, to me, contrary to the comments of Roger and others, ecosystem management is front and center here. What is totally lacking is any discussion of sustainable economic development on the coast. There was not a single commercial user interviewed for the marine GIS study. That is a huge gap. You need to make a statement that we did not consider sustainable economic development.

Seth: We tried (to get input from commercial sector)

Roger: Looking at Coastal Management Policies may be an exercise in finding a way to implement those policies. You can tune these concepts into specific principles or policies for Bay Management. Thanks for all of your hard work.

Steve: The maps we did for the Taunton Bay study are varied in nature (displays one example to groups). We wanted to show users that conditions are different in different estuaries and people understand this very quickly after looking at the maps. There are interpretative maps where you weight a certain parameter on the map and

you can come up with a map that allows you to decide what areas should/shouldn't be developed, etc.

Meeting Conclusion

Kathleen closed the meeting with a reminder that the meeting notes and information about a potential retreat format for the October 2nd steering committee meeting (including arriving Sunday evening, October 1st) would be sent out within the next two weeks.